Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:13PM

In attendance
- College of Business: K. Hartman, T. Luce, Z. Sarikas
- College of Fine Arts: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, D. Thomas
- College of Health Sciences and Professions: A. Sergeev
- Group II: D. Duvert, C. Schwirian
- Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine: S. Inman, S. Williams
- Patton College of Education: S. Helfrich, K. Machtmes, P. Mather
- Regional Campus – Chillicothe: B. Trube
- Regional Campus – Eastern: K. Spiker
- Regional Campus – Lancaster: S. Doty, L. Trautman
- Regional Campus – Southern: C. Orianna
- Regional Campus – Zanesville: J. Taylor, A. White
- Russ College of Engineering: J. Cotton, D. Masel
- Scripps College of Communication: A. Babrow, B. Bates, B. Reader
- Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused: L. Black, G. Brooks (FFL), G. Kessler, B. Sindelar, S. Wyatt

Absent: J. Andrews, C. Bartone, S. Carson, A. Hibbitt, F-C. Jeng, G. Suer, S. Walkowski

MEETING AGENDA
I. President Roderick McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit
II. Faculty Compensation Update: Associate Provost John Day
III. Senior Associate Vice President for IT and Administrative Services Joe Lalley
IV. Roll Call and Approval of the May 4, 2015 Minutes
V. Chair’s Report—Beth Quitslund
   • Updates and Announcements
   • Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 5, 2015
VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ben Bates
VII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt
VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Kevin Mattson
IX. Finance & Facilities Committee—Joe McLaughlin
X. New Business
XI. Adjournment
I. President Roderick McDavis

- **Topic 1: Welcome.** McDavis welcomed Senators and faculty back for the 2015-16 academic year.
- **Topic 2: Ohio Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency.** The Ohio Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency was created by Governor Kasich via an executive order. McDavis provided updates to the Faculty Senate during the 2014-15 academic year. The deadline for the committee to provide a report to the Governor is October 2015. The Governor has asked the task force to brainstorm, study and recommend solutions regarding how Ohio’s public colleges and universities can (1) be more efficient both in expense management and resource generation, (2) offer an education of equal or higher quality, and (3) reduce costs to students and their families.

To date, the Task Force has met four times. Topics of discussion have included:
- college costs and affordability, both across the country and in Ohio
- an overview of some of the efficiency efforts that have been implemented at Ohio institutions
- opportunities related to joint procurement
- reducing the time to degree
- asset reviews
- academic efficiencies (including textbook affordability)
- administrative productivity and efficiencies
- technology opportunities
- best practices for co-located campuses

At the end of its fourth meeting, the Task Force began preliminary discussions of potential recommendations. Ohio University has been represented at all four meetings and has been called on twice to make presentations. Specifically, Vice President Golding was asked to present on asset review and Ohio University-Zanesville Dean Jennifer Cushman presented on best practices for co-located campuses. The fifth and final task force meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 23.

Internally, OHIO is looking for ways it can reduce the cost of obtaining an Ohio University degree *without sacrificing quality.*

II. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

- **Topic 1: AQIP.** The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation visit will be November 2, 3, and 4. The team will visit Athens, Chillicothe, Zanesville, and Southern.

The Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (TLA) Advisory Committee prepared a pamphlet for faculty to prepare for the visit. Benoit encouraged all faculty to review the handout and prepare for the visitation. Benoit emphasized that the information provided in the pamphlet is important for everyone and reinforced that faculty have an important role to play in accreditation and the visit specifically. Benoit also remarked that a number of groups across OHIO have been preparing for the visit for a long time; efforts have included engaging consultants and creating working groups.

A copy of the primary text from the pamphlet is available in *Appendix A.*

- **Topic 2: Enrollment.** Highlights from enrollment information were provided. As of the meeting, OHIO has had the fourth straight record-setting year with the freshman class and the ninth year of overall University enrollment growth.

The freshman class size is 4,423 students (+44, Δ1%). The freshman class includes 667 non-resident students (+77, Δ13.1%) and 618 multi-cultural students (+9, Δ1.4%). Quality indicators for the freshman class include a record ACT composite score of 24.1 (the first time OHIO has ever been above 24.0) and a record high school GPA (3.46 vs. 3.43 last year).
Overall enrollments are also expected to be record enrollments.

- Athens undergraduate +1.63%
- Athens graduate +0.38%
- Athens medical +16.72% (due to opening new campuses)
- Athens eLearning +0.82%
- Regional Higher Education +4.3% (though increases are all through college credit plus)

**Topic 3: OHIO Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency.** Ohio University (OHIO) has appointed a 15-member task force to work on similar issues that align with the Governor’s Task Force. The OHIO Task Force plans to align with state-wide efforts while continuing to give emphasis to the University’s mission. The charge of the OHIO Task Force is (1) reviewing and recommending innovative strategies to deliver high quality educational programs and course content, (2) championing alternative business models, (3) investing in new programs, (4) finding predictable cost models, (5) preserving the OHIO Guarantee, (6) remaining accessible and affordable, and (7) sustaining positive momentum from the past five years to position OHIO as a progressive leader.

The Task Force identified areas for opportunity and divided the Task Force into work groups accordingly. The work group topics were joint purchasing, time to degree, low enrollment courses, and revenue enhancement strategies. Benoit also noted that there is an online suggestion box (https://www.ohio.edu/provost/affordability-efficiency/index.cfm) for those who want to provide suggestions. Benoit encouraged faculty to provide suggestions, which will be shared with the Task Force. The process is now to the point that the smaller work groups are sharing recommendations with the larger Task Force.

The Task Force is also reviewing recommendations from consultants. Recommendations from the Task Force will be shared in a final report.

**Topic 4: Mandatory Reports for the State of Ohio.** Ohio University is required to file a number of reports with the state of Ohio this year. Reports are related to the issues of affordability and efficiency.

- The first report – Senate Challenge Report – is due on October 15. This report should provide details about how OHIO has the potential for saving students 5% on the cost of education
- The Auxiliary Fee Increase Report is also due this fall. The report should provide information about increases/decreases in auxiliary fees (e.g., dorms and meal plans) as well as justifications for fees. In the past, the state has not reviewed auxiliary fees; there is new attention to this topic this year.
- The Course Program and Evaluation Report will be due January 1, 2016 (and then again every five years). This report requires information about low enrollment courses, enrollments by course, academic quality by course, and program reviews for all University programs. In addition, part of this report includes information about how OHIO might work with other Universities in regards to courses with low enrollment and/or programs with low enrollment. The purpose is to identify potential efficiencies through University collaboration.
- The Efficiency Survey is scheduled for October 15; this report provides information about efficiencies that the University has already achieved.

OHIO has also been providing information to the state’s Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency. The information provides recommendations to the Governor’s Task Force.

Benoit notes that the take-away from these efforts is that the state is reviewing a number of issues related to accountability.

**Questions and Discussions**
• In reference to the AQIP visitation in early November, Senator Linda Rice asked if all visits with faculty are scheduled in advance or if there is a possibility of unscheduled meetings during the visit. Benoit explained that it is possible that unscheduled visits may occur. In the past, teams have engaged in conversations with people across campus while walking around the campus. However, because the schedule for the visitation team has not been finalized, the exact agenda for the visit is unknown. Benoit also noted that she will share information as the schedule is finalized.

• In reference to affordability and efficiency, Senator Sandy Doty notes that some of the terms being used are ambiguous including (but not limited to) low enrollment and efficiency. Benoit explained that there have been a number of discussions about defining terms and working through examples. Specifically, the Chancellor has recently said that the State of Ohio is particularly interested in low enrollment courses in low enrollment programs. For these situations, universities may need to collaborate with other universities for select course offerings such as some language courses that OHIO currently offers in collaboration with other universities. By contrast, Benoit noted examples of appropriate low enrollment courses such as independent study or music courses. As such, universities will need to be careful to offer statistics with context and nuance. Benoit further explained that efforts are being made to get clarification about the reports. For example, will all institutions use the same criteria or different criteria? This is important in order to accurately compare across universities. The Provosts at the various institutions in Ohio are in discussions to define terms and clarify reporting.

• Senator Joe McLaughlin mentioned the recent problems with temperature control in Ellis Hall and asked about the decision-making process with respect to OHIO priorities about capital projects. McDavis explained that there is a committee that involves a wide range of administrators from across the University that makes decisions. The committee works with the Deans to make a list of needs and then prioritizes the list. A proposal is organized by recommendation and submitted to the Board of Trustees. McDavis notes that a number of capital projects are scheduled during the next few years. McDavis also explained the central bank that the University has created through the sale of $250M in bonds. OHIO has invested that money, which will earn income and be used for capital improvements.

Benoit added by stating that there are assessments of the buildings done with respect to immediate and less immediate needs. Building assessments are divided into sub-category projects including (but not limited to) HVAC, electric, and plumbing. All of the needs are organized into a list; the list of priorities considers both deferred maintenance as well as programmatic needs. Deans provide input about the list and the priorities. In addition, Benoit notes that there is an emergency fund for unexpected occurrences.

• Senator Joe McLaughlin asked for the name of the committee and the process in which input is provided and stops. Vice President for Finance and Administration Steve Golding said that the committee is the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee. Gold notes that priorities come from Deans and FPAC through multiple conversations. Golding also states that this year’s theme was roofs because there is a major problem across campus with leaking roofs.

McDavis remarks that there a number of proposals presented. The group discusses and debates extensively before making recommendations to the Board. The Board asks questions and makes recommendations. In addition, there are shifts to the six-year plan for various reasons including some unexpected change such as a change in costs or an immediate need. Accordingly, Benoit remarked that input is continuously provided.

• Senator Bill Reader asked how to obtain a copy of the current list. Golding explained that the previous six-year capital budget plan is available on the Trustee Board website. The current list of priorities is still in development. Golding and McDavis also mentioned that the projects are
scheduled such that that faculty can be moved around to different buildings while other buildings are being renovated.

II. Faculty Compensation Update: Associate Provost John Day

- **Topic: Faculty Compensation Update.** Day provided an update regarding faculty compensation. The presentation included a description of the Task Force charge, methodology used to evaluate faculty compensation, the original projection, the results, summaries, and notes about non-tenure track and regional faculty efforts. A copy of the presentation is available in Appendix B.

**Questions and Discussions**

- A senator asked about Group III. Day responded by noting that, because Group III are part-time, it is not possible to do the same analysis because Group III are not raise eligible.
- Senator Sharon Inman asked for reason(s) that the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine is not part of the analysis. Day remarked that there is not comparable data published and available. However, Day also noted that there has been some effort to look at comparable data and that the Dean has been encouraged to follow similar faculty compensation adjustments.

III. Senior Associate Vice President for IT and Administrative Services Joe Lalley

- **Topic 1: Mass Electronic Communications.** Lalley provided information about a proposed policy for mass electronic communications. The presentation included a discussion of the purpose/need for the policy, elements of the proposed policy, categories of mass communication, communication stewards, expectations about the approval process, and restrictions. A copy of the presentation is available in Appendix C.

**Questions and Discussions**

- Senator Bill Reader asked for clarification about why the policy was being proposed. Lalley responded by explaining that there is currently a great deal of e-mail that is exchanged; this e-mail is currently unrestricted. Some receivers may not want to receive some of these e-mails that are being sent. Some of the messages may conflict with other messaging. The senator expressed concern about censorship at a public university and remarked that the policy may have some First Amendment concerns. In the addition, this senator was also concerned about approval by Marketing and Communications as the body who determines what messages get approved and denied.
- Vice-Chair David Thomas asked about the length of the process for receiving approval. Lalley responded by stating that the length of time would be a matter of hours (not days). Furthermore, the proposed process is such that e-mail sender contacts OIT, OIT contacts Marketing & Communications, and Marketing & Communications gets to make a decision.
- Chair Beth Quitslund asked if there was an appeal process. Lalley remarked that it would be quickly moved up to senior administration.
- Senator Kevin Matson asked for clarification regarding the reason(s) for identifying Marketing & Communications as the party responsible for the messaging. Lalley explained that the Office of Marketing & Communications is responsible for the University’s messaging and branding. Because so many messages are communicated, it may be important to time messages.
- Senator Bill Reader asked if this policy was an approved policy or a proposed policy. Lalley noted that this is only a proposed policy at this point.
• Senator Joe McLaughlin said that there appears to be some sentiment among faculty about the need to formalize an appeal process.

• Senator Bill Reader asked in what capacity Legal Affairs has been and would be involved. Benoit and Lalley responded by stating the Legal Affairs reviews all proposed policies but that Legal Affairs are not likely to be involved in the message approval process.


Questions and Discussions
• None

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the May 4, 2015 Minutes
• Roll call (Hartman)
• Doty moved to approve the minutes, seconded by White. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

V. Chair’s Report (Beth Quitslund)
• Topic 1: Updates and Announcements
   • Signed Resolutions: Quitslund provided information about the Resolutions signed during the summer: (a) Resolution to Revise the Faculty Handbook as Appropriate for the Revised University Policy on Sexual Misconduct and (b) Resolution Establishing (new) Minimum Requirements for Clinical/Professional Doctoral Programs.
   • Unsigned Resolutions: Quitslund also explained the Resolutions that the Provost declined to sign. First, the Provost declined to sign the Resolution regarding Shared Governance in Faculty Compensation and the Resolution on Guidelines for the Year 2 Faculty Compensation Implementation Plan. The reasons are available on the website, and include vagueness, over-restriction on the decision-making process, and the then-indeterminate state of the university budget. Second, the Provost declined to sign the Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding the Role of Group III Faculty for issues with two parts of the resolution. First, the implication that departments should look at how much teaching was being done by Group III faculty as a group when evaluating whether it was prudent to request a Group I or II hire. Second, the resolution stating conditions when a department “must” request a Group I or II faculty member, preferring the word “should.” As a result of this resolution not being signed, the university community should be aware that the previous Handbook language is still in effect.
   • Board of Trustee Updates – Academic (David Thomas): Thomas represents the faculty with respect to academic issues. Thomas explained that the OHIO dashboard was presented to the Board. There were also presentations on retention & enrollment and community standards. Thomas also reminded faculty about the importance of the AQIP visitation. Specifically, faculty should do whatever we can to prepare, including articulating program outcomes as well explaining how we use of assessment to develop a better learning experience.
   • Board of Trustee Updates – Resource (Joe McLaughlin): McLaughlin explained that there were presentations about the budget update, the Century Bond, and construction projects. One notable project was the Trustees approval of $1M for a metering project that will measure how
much energy is being used in buildings across campus. It is unclear as to whether the metering project will be included in RCM such that units may be charged for energy usage under RCM.

- **Communications Survey:** Quitslund noted that the Senate Executive Committee will be sending out a very brief survey to all OU faculty with the aim of making sure that we can hear and be heard clearly. Quitslund ask senators to encourage colleagues to respond.

- **Professional Ethics Committees:** Quitslund explained that College or Campus Professional Ethics Committees have three members appointed by the senators from the college and three appointed by the dean. Because these are three-year terms, we normally have one person appointed by Senate rotate off each year. There are two exceptions: Russ has already made its appointments, and A&S is off-cycle and does not need any new appointments this year. Quitslund asked each college/campus’s senators to briefly caucus and provide names at the end of the meeting.

- **Topic 2: Upcoming Senate Meeting.** Monday, October 5, 2015

  **Questions and Discussions**
  
  - Senator Orianna Carter asked about how often the Professional Ethics Committee typically meets. Quitslund noted that the Committee only meets when there is a problem or issue to address. As such, the ideal scenario is for the Committee to meet as infrequently as possible.

- **VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ben Bates)**

  - Committee Chair Bates noted that there was nothing to report from EPSA.

- **VII. Professional Relations Committee (Beth Quitslund on behalf of Sarah Wyatt)**

  - Quitslund announced that the Provost Award for Excellence in Teaching has been launched this year. Nominations were already due. This is a teaching award for eligible Group II faculty. The award is the same as the Presidential Teaching Award.

- **VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)**

  - Committee Chair Mattson remarked that the P&T Committee will be working on a Resolution regarding Group II promotions. Ideally, the Committee plans to have Resolution for next meeting.

- **IX. Finance & Facilities Committee (Joe McLaughlin)**

  - Committee Chair McLaughlin explained that the first F&F meeting was held last week. F&F has identified four topic areas for this academic year: (1) health benefits and reductions, (2) deferred maintenance, (3) energy improvement and plan, and (4) attention to the OHIO foundation. F&F remains a committee that is very involved with constituent relations. McLaughlin encourages faculty to speak with the committee.

- **X. New Business**

  - **Topic: Proposed Mass Communications Policy**

    - Senator Bill Reader expressed concern about the proposed Mass Communication policy—especially with respect to possible First Amendment issues. The senator argued that the faculty should exercise oversight to this policy and provide input into the policy. Quitslund noted that these are special kinds of e-mails that exceed 200 recipients.
• Senator Linda Rice remarked that s/he thought the intent of the policy was to curb outside parties from flooding in-boxes, yet that does not appear to be the case. Quitslund remarked that s/he believes that it refers to internal e-mails.
• Senator Bill Reader noted that no examples of problems were provided to justify the policy.
• Senator Sandy Doty mentioned recollection about a previous discussion about problems with mass communication.
• Senator Amy White remarked that s/he has experienced some problems previously with faculty and/or staff that send mass e-mails for events unrelated to University business.
• Senator Bill Reader noted that sending a polite notice to someone else to stop spamming and having to get prior approval for mass e-mail communications are two different issues.
• Senator Sharon Inman asked for clarification about why the policy is necessary – especially with the new Clutter function in Outlook.
• Senator David Thomas asked whether or not the Office of Marketing & Communications reports directly to the President. The response was that it does.

XI. Adjournment
❖ Doty moved to adjourn, seconded by Luce. The meeting was adjourned at 9:01pm.
Appendix A: Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee Pamphlet

Ohio University is under reaffirmation of accreditation review by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The review team will visit the Athens, Chillicothe, Southern, and Zanesville campuses on November 2-4, 2015. This summary provides the opportunity for faculty and instructors to reflect on and review how we assess student learning, and describes what we should know and do before the visit.

WHAT OHIO FACULTY AND INSTRUCTORS SHOULD KNOW

1. **Accreditation criteria have changed.** OHIO’s institutional accreditation is HLC’s AQIP (Academic Quality Improvement Program). In 2013, HLC implemented new accreditation criteria: (1) mission, (2) integrity, (3) teaching & learning, (4) evaluating (assessing) and improving teaching & learning, and (5) resources & planning. Criteria are organized into 21 Core Components; each component must be addressed. [For a summary of HLS’s 21 Core Components, see http://www.ncahlc.org/Criteria-Eligibility-and-Candidacy/criteria-and-core-components.html]

2. **OHIO reaffirmation of accreditation is not assumed.** Reviewers will evaluate OHIO’s 21 core components to determine if the component is met without concerns, met with concerns, or not met. Components evaluated as met with concerns or not met will require OHIO to follow specific recommendations for improvement and to submit to formal monitoring that focuses attention in these areas.

3. **OHIO’s accreditation status is important.** Failure to achieve reaffirmation of accreditation will impact OHIO’s (and its students’) eligibility to receive federal and/or state grants, loans, credit transfer, some state licensures, and some tuition reimbursement.

4. **OHIO’s accreditation consultant revealed important areas for improvement in the evaluation of teaching & learning.** A preliminary review found strong evidence that OHIO meets most Criteria including Quality of Teaching & Learning (Criterion 3). However, the preliminary review also found deficiencies in OHIO’s systematic Evaluation of Teaching & Learning (Criterion 4: program review and assessment). Although some academic programs meet expectations, others do not currently provide such evidence.

5. **Establishing program learning objectives, assuring student learning, and improving programs are responsibilities of the faculty.** Criterion 4 requires demonstrations of program effectiveness and educational quality through processes that (1) assess student achievement of learning outcomes and (2) use assessment information to improve student learning. Because faculty are the drivers of OHIO’s curriculum, teaching, and student learning, faculty are responsible for demonstrating continuous improvement to teaching and learning through student achievement of learning outcomes. (For more information about AQIP, please visit OHIO’s Institutional Accreditation Web page: http://www.ohio.edu/provost/accreditation/aqip.cfm)

WHAT OHIO FACULTY AND INSTRUCTION SHOULD DO

The review team will talk to a variety of faculty groups and individual faculty and instructors. As such, it is the responsibility of individual faculty members to be prepared before the visit.

1. **Consider your contributions to OHIO’s mission and your program’s learning objectives.** The central component of OHIO’s mission is the intellectual and personal development of its students (for details, see http://www.ohio.edu/president/priorities.mission.cfm). As a faculty member or instructor,
you should consider your contributions to the mission and how you help students achieve your program’s learning objectives and outcomes.

2. **Know how your program assesses student learning.** Assessments are measurements of student learning with respect to specific learning objectives. Assessments vary widely and include (but are not limited to) faculty evaluations of tests, portfolios, auditions, creative works, and written assignments. Most programs already use assessments as an integral part of teaching and learning. As a faculty member or instructor, you should know how your program assesses student achievement of program learning objectives—beyond assigning grades. While assessment of course level learning outcomes is important, the review team will be looking for the process by which programmatic (degree, major, etc.) and university level (General Education, co-curricular, etc.) learning outcomes are assessed.

3. **Understand how your program uses assessment information for continuous improvement.** Assessment is designed to provide information to help continually improve student learning. As a faculty member or instructor, you should understand your program’s current and future efforts to assess student learning outcomes, and how that information has been and will be used to improve your academic program.
Appendix B: Faculty Compensation Update (John Day)

Faculty Compensation Task Force Charge
- Develop a multi-year plan to maximize our investment in faculty compensation to attract and retain talented faculty
- Include full time tenure-track and Group II faculty on Athens and regional campuses
- Analyze comparative faculty compensation data
- Identify appropriate peer comparisons
- Determine goals for competitive average salary position
- Project the costs for attaining that position over three years

Methodology
- To project where each university would be in three years, the change in salary over the previous three years was used to calculate a three-year average salary increase trend for each university.
- This trend is then applied to the total salary base in the starting year to get a new salary base for the next year
- This increase was compounded each year for three years to get the total salary base in Year 3
- That Year 3 base was then divided by the total number of faculty to get an average salary in year 3 and that average salary was then used to project the relative ranking for each university in Year 3
- This relative ranking provided the amount that needed to be added to the Ohio University total base salary in order to overtake the total base salary of the university in the 3rd position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio University</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-13 Total Salary Base</td>
<td>3 Yr. Avg</td>
<td>Projected Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$21,788,970</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$610,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$23,625,300</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$756,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>$10,061,928</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$402,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-13 Total Salary Base</td>
<td>3 Yr. Avg</td>
<td>Projected Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$46,876,860</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$1,593,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$32,171,428</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$1,126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>$21,712,896</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$607,961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The 3-year average is applied to the total salary base 12-13 to project the total salary base for 13-14
- That base is divided by the N to get the projected average salary for 13-14
- This is done again for Year 2 and Year 3 to determine the 15-16 (Year 3) average salary
- The difference between the Ohio University total salary base and that for the university in third position was divided by 3 to get the Additional Salary Increase that was needed to move OHIO into the third position
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes 9.4.15

Original Projection

Original Plan - Projection of 16-17 starting with 13-14 actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101,111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>95,694</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99,354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>79,766</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89,102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>79,061</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88,950</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>77,175</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87,864</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OU</td>
<td>76,475</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86,708</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>75,116</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85,505</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>74,766</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85,137</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>73,693</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79,080</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>68,972</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76,411</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>63,479</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71,612</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>61,596</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66,375</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>58,219</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To catch 3rd 9,793 3,965 2,586
Investment 2,056,618 1,209,292 382,737 3,648,647
Y3 685,539 Y3 403,097 Y3 127,579 1,216,216
PV Y2 666,867 PV Y2 390,598 PV Y2 122,672
PV Y1 648,703 PV Y1 378,487 PV Y1 117,954

- Task Force report projected 15-16 salaries and rankings starting with 12-13 data
- Year 1 Implementation started with 13-14 data to project 16-17 salaries

Results after Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>2012-13 Rank</th>
<th>2013-14 Rank</th>
<th>2014-15 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>109,506</td>
<td>111,236</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>92,010</td>
<td>99,252</td>
<td>103,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>110,820</td>
<td>111,026</td>
<td>116,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>98,433</td>
<td>100,069</td>
<td>101,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>106,956</td>
<td>109,915</td>
<td>111,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>105,119</td>
<td>106,724</td>
<td>111,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>136,948</td>
<td>139,239</td>
<td>142,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>103,757</td>
<td>105,522</td>
<td>109,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State</td>
<td>72,153</td>
<td>72,485</td>
<td>73,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>106,525</td>
<td>106,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>110,126</td>
<td>108,986</td>
<td>110,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>90,503</td>
<td>90,685</td>
<td>89,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to 3rd</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohio University Office of Institutional Research - 2014-2015 AAUP Group I Faculty Salary Study
2012 numbers are updated since original Task Force report

Original Plan was based on 2012-13; Year 1 Implementation occurred in FY 2015 with impact reflected in 2014-15 salary and ranking
### Associate Professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13 Rank</th>
<th>2013-14 Rank</th>
<th>2014-15 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>82,250</td>
<td>83,057</td>
<td>83,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>65,918</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>80,228</td>
<td>78,736</td>
<td>80,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>73,219</td>
<td>74,984</td>
<td>74,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>80,132</td>
<td>82,012</td>
<td>84,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>78,249</td>
<td>82,136</td>
<td>85,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>91,994</td>
<td>94,148</td>
<td>96,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio University</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,303</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State</td>
<td>61,098</td>
<td>61,933</td>
<td>63,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>83,300</td>
<td>83,658</td>
<td>83,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>80,990</td>
<td>81,990</td>
<td>84,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>72,004</td>
<td>73,468</td>
<td>72,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance to 3rd: 4,790 - 3,754 - 2,100

*Ohio University Office of Institutional Research - 2014-2015 AAUP Group I Faculty Salary Study*  
2012 numbers are updated since original Task Force report

Original Plan was based on 2012-13; Year 1 Implementation occurred in FY 2015 with impact reflected in 2014-15 salary and ranking

### Assistant Professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13 Rank</th>
<th>2013-14 Rank</th>
<th>2014-15 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>70,285</td>
<td>70,931</td>
<td>70,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>58,043</td>
<td>63,012</td>
<td>66,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>63,488</td>
<td>63,841</td>
<td>69,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>67,359</td>
<td>70,815</td>
<td>71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>69,006</td>
<td>71,275</td>
<td>73,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>71,322</td>
<td>74,998</td>
<td>81,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>85,072</td>
<td>84,761</td>
<td>85,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio University</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,986</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State</td>
<td>52,816</td>
<td>52,597</td>
<td>53,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>73,280</td>
<td>73,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>64,577</td>
<td>66,882</td>
<td>72,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>60,349</td>
<td>60,843</td>
<td>61,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance to 3rd: 3,336 - 2,913 - 1,600

*Ohio University Office of Institutional Research - 2014-2015 AAUP Group I Faculty Salary Study*  
2012 numbers are updated since original Task Force report

Original Plan was based on 2012-13; Year 1 Implementation occurred in FY 2015 with impact reflected in 2014-15 salary and ranking
Updated Projection – Year 2

Updated Year 2 Plan - Projection of 16-17 starting with 14-15 actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>150,860</td>
<td>102,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>122,054</td>
<td>93,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>120,280</td>
<td>91,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>120,259</td>
<td>88,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>119,087</td>
<td>88,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>117,968</td>
<td>88,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>113,553</td>
<td>86,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>109,616</td>
<td>85,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>104,772</td>
<td>79,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>91,480</td>
<td>75,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>77,702</td>
<td>69,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To catch 3rd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>91,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>90,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>79,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>77,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>74,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>73,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>73,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>62,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>59,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Year 3 | 247,391 | 423,276 | 211,918 |
| PV Year 2 | 238,564 | 407,388 | 202,212 |

The Year 2 Implementation now starts with 14-15 actual data to project 16-17 salaries and rankings
The three year trends used to make the projection are also updated

Summary
• Plan has begun to have a positive effect – better rankings and smaller gaps compared to #3
• Original projection – $1.2M investment each year for three years = $3.6M total
• Updated Year 2 Projection - $890K investment each year for the remaining two years = $1.76M
• This methodology is somewhat volatile since trends are influenced by retirements and promotions as well as general salary inflation
• As a result, we did better than originally expected at the Professor rank, about as predicted at the Associate Professor rank and less than expected at the Assistant Professor rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Plan</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment per Year</td>
<td>685,539</td>
<td>403,097</td>
<td>127,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to 3rd</td>
<td>9,793</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>2,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated Year 2 Plan</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment per Year</td>
<td>247,391</td>
<td>423,276</td>
<td>211,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to 3rd</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Tenure Track and Regional Faculty
• These faculty groups received the same percentage investment as Athens Group I faculty
• This was 2.19% in Year 1
• With the results from Year 1 being better than expected overall, this will be 1.36% in Year 2
Appendix C: Proposed Policy Mass Electronic Communications (Joe Lalley)

Purpose and Need
- To establish consistent procedures for handling emergency and non-emergency mass electronic communications to the entire university or to significant constituent groups within the university.
- Ohio University currently has multiple unrestricted technologies in use that permit individuals and departments to send unsolicited communications to large groups of users, up to and including all students and all employees.
- The university needs to manage the use of these technologies to ensure that mission critical messages reach their appropriate audiences at an appropriate time.
- Currently, there is no approval process for sending mass communications to the university community.
- This lack of oversight, combined with easy access to mass communications tools, has resulted in a flood of quasi-official communications.
- This, in turn, dilutes the effectiveness of electronic communications and increases the risk that emergency and high importance, official communications will go unread.
- The proposed policy will address this issue by establishing an approval process.

Elements of Proposed Policy
- Proposed policy does not prohibit communications between faculty and students or other official communications necessary to efficiently and effectively conduct the normal daily business of the university.

Categories of Mass Electronic Communications
- Emergency. Highly important, time-sensitive messages such as security alerts, campus closings due to weather, notices of major system outages, or other notices that pertain to an immediate threat to life or property, or other extraordinary circumstances.
- Priority. Highly important, time sensitive messages such as government reporting requirements, student grade reports, financial aid award notices, notification of records holds or policy changes, and student class schedules.
- Informational. Messages that are directly related to university business or academic operations but which do not fall into either of the above categories.

Communication Stewards for University Constituent Groups
- All faculty – The Executive Vice President and Provost
  - All regional campus faculty and/or staff – Dean of University Outreach
- All staff – Vice President for Finance and Administration
  - All administrators – Human Resources
  - All classified staff – Human Resources
  - All bargaining unit staff – Human Resources
- All students – Vice President for Student Affairs
  - All undergraduate students – Vice President for Student Affairs
  - All graduate students – Dean of the Graduate College
  - All applicants or admitted but not enrolled students – Vice Provost for Enrollment Management
  - All regional campus students – Dean of University Outreach
  - All e-campus students – Vice Provost for E-Learning & Strategic Partnerships
- Entire university community – President

Stewards may designate one or more persons to act on their behalf.
Exceptions to the Approval Process

• Planning unit heads may approve distribution to students, faculty, and/or staff who are exclusively within their units. For example, the dean of a college may approve communications to students or employees within his or her college, the chair of an academic department may approve communications to students or employees within his or her department, and the head of an administrative department may approve communications to employees in his or her department.

• Faculty and staff in official administrative positions have the right to contact staff or students under their scope of administrative responsibility without prior approval.

• The following units may send mass electronic communications directly related to their areas of operation without prior approval:
  – Office of the Bursar
  – Student Financial Aid
  – Office of the University Registrar
  – Finance
  – Human Resources
  – Information Technology
  – OUPD
  – CIRT
  – Residential Housing

• The chair of each university senate may communicate with his or her constituents about matters of that senate’s concern without prior approval.

• The President, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration may communicate with the campus community without prior approval.

Restrictions

• Emergency Text Messaging – Because text messaging may impose a cost on recipients, the use of mass text messaging shall be reserved for emergency notices only. This restriction does not apply to “opt-in” services where recipients have explicitly asked to receive text notifications.

• No Spam – No member of the campus community may use university resources to send unsolicited mass electronic communications for any content outside the scope of the university’s mission.

• No Sensitive Data – Sensitive data may not be sent via mass electronic communications. When in doubt, do not send. Instead, consult with OIT or Legal Affairs.

• Avoid Use of Attachments – In keeping with information security recommendations against opening unsolicited attachments, mass electronic communications should avoid including attachments.

• Internal Solutions Preferred – The university’s email, text and portal services are the preferred channels for mass communication. Third party, external vendors should only be used if they offer critical functionality not found in a university service, or when research or grant requirements mandate specific approaches. Such exceptions should be coordinated through OIT.

• Delivery Limitations – Mass electronic communications do not guarantee immediate contact with the intended audience. Keep in mind the following caveats:
  – Message delivery takes time to complete and can vary greatly depending on circumstances, sometimes beyond the control of the university.
  – Recipients may not check their messages frequently or at all.
  – Not all members of university constituent groups are active users of electronic communications channels.
  – Some email clients may not be compatible with the software used to generate mass mailings, rendering those messages difficult to read.
  – Recipients may configure their software or devices to filter or delete mass communications unread.
Process Overview
OIT will facilitate the submission, approval and distribution of mass electronic communications in a timely manner. Although the tools used to implement this process may change, the process should include following basic steps:

1. End user submits a mass communication request to OIT with the following details:
   a) Subject
   b) Sender
   c) Message body
   d) Audience
   e) Preferred timing
   f) Preferred medium or media
2. OIT contacts University Communications and Marketing and the appropriate steward(s) for approval.
3. University Communications and Marketing and the steward(s) approve or deny the message request and its timing and notify OIT of their decision.
4. OIT takes action based on #3 above
5. Action
   a) Approved: OIT will send the message and notify the end user when the message will be sent.
   b) Denied: OIT will notify the end user that the request was denied and will pass on any comments supplied by University Communications and Marketing and the steward(s). Where appropriate, OIT will facilitate communications between the end user, University Communications and Marketing and the steward(s) to discuss possible edits to a message, audience changes, alternate media, revised timing, etc.

• University Communications and Marketing administers mass electronic communication messages for executive level offices only, but is available as a resource for other message senders. If a sender has questions about the content or clarity of their message, or would like guidance on the appropriate timing or delivery method for a message, they may seek feedback from University Communications and Marketing’s Communication Services team.

Questions and Comments
Appendix D: 2015 Summer Projects Updates (Joe Lalley)

2015 Projects Underway

- Alden Library
  - Roof
- CSC
- Ellis Hall
  - Flat roof repairs
  - Penthouse sealing
- Hwa Wei Lee Library Annex
  - Building Envelope
  - HVAC
- Lin Hall
  - Roof, Fire and HVAC systems
- Memorial Auditorium
  - Building envelope

2015 Projects Completed

- Aquatic Center ADA Improvements
- Athens Hockhocking Bike Path
- Bobcat Lane/Oxbow Trail
- Boyd Hall Dining
- College of Communications Phase II
  - RTV
  - Scripps Hall Renovations
- Emeriti Park Lighting Upgrade
- Lindley Hall Renovation
- Morton Hall
  - Classroom upgrade
- Tupper Hall Renovation
- Irwin
  - Roof
- Grovesvenor
  - Roof
- Stocker Hall
  - Fire sprinkler repair
  - Flat roofs

2016 Planned Projects

- ADA Remediation
- Bentley Hall
  - Roof
- Chubb Hall
  - Roof
- Clippinger Hall
  - Roof
- College Green Painting
  - Cutler
  - McGuffy
  - Wilson
- Morton Hall
- Fire protection
- Roof
- Classroom upgrade

- Putnum
  - Roof
- Siegfried
  - Roof, Electric, Fire Systems, Doors, Windows and partial HVAC
- Sing Tao
- Vanvorhees Drive

**Emergency Infrastructure Projects**
- Still on track to stop burning coal by December 31, 2015
- Results of 2015 Annual Steam Shutdown
  - Promising

**Lausche Water Usage**

![Lausche Makeup Water in Gallons](chart1)

![Lausche Makeup Water Cost](chart2)
Lausche BTU Usage

- 21% less energy June, July and August 2015 compared to 2014
- Average 20% Energy Reduction June and July
- $113K Savings over 2014
- Using 2015 Weighted Cost/BTU